arXiv:1601.03927v2 [math.PR] 29 Oct 2016

A combinatorial approach to small ball inequalities for sums and differences

Jiange Li, Mokshay Madiman*

November 1, 2016

Abstract

Small ball inequalities have been extensively studied in the setting of Gaussian processes and associated Banach or Hilbert spaces. In this paper, we focus on studying small ball probabilities for sums or differences of independent, identically distributed random elements taking values in very general sets. Depending on the setting– abelian or nonabelian groups, or vector spaces, or Banach spaces– we provide a collection of inequalities relating different small ball probabilities that are sharp in many cases of interest. We prove these distribution-free probabilistic inequalities by showing that underlying them are inequalities of extremal combinatorial nature, related among other things to classical packing problems such as the kissing number problem. Applications are given to moment inequalities.

1 Introduction

Given the ubiquity of sums of independent, identically distributed random variables in probability theory (as well as, indirectly, in many other parts of mathematics), it is natural to look for ways to estimate the probability that a sum lies in a given measurable set. In general, this can be a rather complex calculation, and is often intractable. The *raison d'etre* of this paper is the fact that it is often much easier to estimate the probability that a symmetric random variable lies in a symmetric set; so if we can find a way to relate the desired probability to a probability of this type, then in many circumstances our task is significantly simplified.

The most general setting in which we can talk about sums (and symmetry) is that of group-valued random variables, where the group operation represents summation. Thus, to state our problem more precisely, consider independent and identically distributed random variables X and Y taking values in a (possibly nonabelian) topological group with group operation $+$ and its Borel σ-field; then our problem is to find good bounds on $\mathbb{P}(X+Y \in F)$ for arbitrary measurable F in terms of $\mathbb{P}(X-Y \in K)$ for symmetric (i.e., closed with respect to inversion in the group) measurable sets K. Since the distribution of $X-Y$ is always symmetric in that it is invariant with respect to inversion of the random variable, this would provide a reduction of the form mentioned earlier. We also study a related problem, namely that of estimating $\mathbb{P}(X-Y \in F)$ for arbitrary measurable F in terms of $\mathbb{P}(X-Y \in K)$ for symmetric measurable sets K.

*Both authors are with the Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Delaware. This work was supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation through grants CCF-1346564 and DMS-1409504 (CAREER). Email: lijiange@udel.edu, madiman@udel.edu

It might seem that the problem stated is somewhat abstruse; however, it is closely related to a number of influential streams of recent research. To highlight these connections, we discuss the problem from various perspectives.

Symmetrization. Symmetrization is a basic and powerful meta-technique that arises in many different guises in different parts of mathematics. Instances include Steiner symmetrization in convex geometry and the study of isoperimetric phenomena [10, 11], Rademacher symmetrization in probability in Banach spaces and empirical process theory [53, 28, 24, 59], the use of rearrangements in functional analysis [46, 3], the study of partial differential equations [39] and probability theory [66, 12, 65], and others too numerous to mention. One goal of this paper is to develop a symmetrization technique for estimating small ball probabilities of sums and differences of independent and identically distributed (henceforth, i.i.d.) random vairables. We call these small ball probabilities even though there may be no "ball" under consideration (for instance, no norm in the general group settings that we will consider), because when considered in the context of finite-dimensional vector spaces, these are related to inequalities for the probability of lying in a ball with respect to some norm.

Concentration functions. The notion of the concentration function was introduced by P. Lévy, as a means of describing in a flexible way the spread or concentration of a real-valued random variable that may not have finite moments. For a real-valued random variable X with distribution P_X, the Lévy concentration function is given by $Q(X,s) = \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} P_X([x,x+s]))$ for $s > 0$. While there was already much attention paid to concentration functions in classical probability theory (see, e.g., [45, 17, 41, 60, 21, 22, 40, 27, 29, 55]), their study received renewed attention in recent years [15, 16, 61, 23, 20, 57] because of the relevance of arithmetic structure to the concentration function of linear combinations of i.i.d. random variables, as well as applications to random matrix theory. While we do not directly address the literature on concentration functions in our note, our results may be seen as providing bounds on multidimensional or non-Euclidean analogs of concentration functions in general spaces. Indeed, a natural way to define the concentration function in a general setting, say an abelian group G, would be to set

$$Q(X,F) = \sup_{x\in G} \mathbb{P}(X \in x + F),$$

where the set-valued parameter F plays the role of the parameter s in the definition $Q(X,s)$ of the concentration function for real-valued random variables. Since the constants that appear in our results are packing numbers $N(F,K)$ that are invariant with respect to translations of F, our results directly imply concentration function bounds. For instance, Theorem 3.1 implies the following statement: *If F is an arbitrary measurable subset of an abelian topological group G and K is a measurable subset of G containing the identity in its interior, then for any pair X, Y of G-valued random variables that are independent and identically distributed, we have*

$$Q(X+Y,F) \le N(F,K)\cdot Q(X-Y,K). \tag{1}$$

Rényi entropy comparisons. By taking balls of vanishing radius in a metrizable, locally compact abelian group G, and considering independent random variables X, Y drawn from a distribution on G that has a density with respect to the Haar measure, the inequality (1) yields (under appropriate conditions) an inequality relating the essential supremum of the density of $X+Y$ and that of the density of $X-Y$. This may be interpreted as relating the Rényi entropies of order ∞ of $X+Y$ and $X-Y$. Inequalities for these quantities have attracted interest from different communities including information theory and convex geometry (see,

e.g., [50, 51]), and comparing Rényi entropies of $X+Y$ and $X-Y$ in particular is closely related to the study of more-sums-than-differences sets (see, e.g., [1]) as well as sum-difference inequalities (see, e.g., [48, 49]) in additive combinatorics.

Packing problems/extremal combinatorics. In 1995, Alon and Yuster [2] showed that for i.i.d. real-valued random variables X, Y,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X-Y| \leq b) < (2\lceil b/a \rceil - 1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(|X-Y| \leq a), \tag{2}$$

thus answering a question raised by Y. Peres and G. Margulis. They also observed that the optimal constants in such estimates are closely related to the kissing number problem, which is a long-standing problem in geometry; indeed, the kissing number in $\mathbb{R}^3$ was a subject of discussion between Isaac Newton and David Gregory in 1690's. A similar probabilistic inequality proved by Katona [31] is closely related to Turán-type theorems for triangle-free graphs. It turns out that behind the main results of this paper, which among other things generalize significantly the inequality (2) of [2], are actually statements from extremal combinatorics, which we prove en route to proving our main results. This strengthens the link between extremal combinatorial phenomena and probabilistic inequalities, in a much more general setting than that of [2], in analogy with similar links developed by Katona in a series of papers (see, e.g., [30, 38]).

Moment inequalities. Probability bounds are of course closely related to moment inequalities, and our results in particular can be used to develop a number of moment inequalities for functions of sums and differences of random variables under various assumptions on the distribution and/or the function. Such inequalities are of intrinsic interest since they serve as tools in a variety of areas.

Random walks. For $0 < a < 2b$, the following sharp symmetrization inequality for i.i.d. real-valued random variables X, Y is proved in [18]:

$$\mathbb{P}(|X+Y| \leq b) < \lceil 2b/a \rceil \cdot \mathbb{P}(|X-Y| \leq a). \tag{3}$$

For $a \geq 2b$, the estimate still holds with " $\leq$ " in the middle. This generalizes the earlier work of Schultze and von Weizsächer [63], which considered the special case $a = b$ and used it as a key ingredient in studying the level crossing probabilities for random walks on the real line. The results of this paper contain those of [18], and although we do not investigate this direction further here, it is conceivable that our results would be useful in the study of random walks on groups.

Having briefly provided motivation from different points of view, let us say something about our methods, especially as compared with those of [18], which focused on random variables taking values in a separable Banach space and may be seen as a precursor to this paper. In exploring small ball inequalities for sums and differences on general groups, the reason we study the problem from a combinatorial point of view is two-fold: firstly, it seems to be impossible to generalize the analytical technique developed in [18] to the group setting because it relies essentially on the availability of a dilation operation on the space, and secondly (and perhaps more importantly), it is reasonable to expect a deterministic phenomenon behind these estimates since they are independent of the probability distributions imposes on our random variables.

In Section 2, we justify this intuition that distribution-free probabilistic estimates should be connected to a deterministic phenomena, which essentially follows from the Law of Large

Numbers. Since our findings, not surprisingly, differ depending on how much structure we assume of our ambient set, we deploy Sections 3, 4 and 5 respectively to explore what can be said for abelian groups, nonabelian groups, and topological vector spaces. In Section 6, we discuss the tightness of our inequalities. Section 7 is devoted to various applications, including moment inequalities in normed vector spaces.

2 A combinatorial perspective on distribution-free inequalities

In this section, we demonstrate a combinatorial approach, which enables us to prove distribution-free probabilistic inequalities by considering their combinatorial analogues. The idea was originally used by Katona [31] to prove probabilistic inequalities using results from graph theory.

Let X be a random variable taking values in certain measurable space, and let F, K be two measurable subsets of the k-fold product space. Given a sequence $X_1, \cdots, X_m$ of independent copies of X, the random variable $T_m(X, F)$ is defined to be

$$T_m(X, F) = |\{(i_1, \cdots, i_k) : i_1 \neq \cdots \neq i_k, (X_{i_1}, \cdots, X_{i_k}) \in F\}|.$$

Similarly we can define $T_m(X, K)$. For a deterministic sequence $x_1, \cdots, x_m$, we define

$$T_m(F) = |\{(i_1, \cdots, i_k) : i_1 \neq \cdots \neq i_k, (x_{i_1}, \cdots, x_{i_k}) \in F\}|.$$

The quantity $T_m(K)$ is defined similarly.

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose that there is a function $h_k(m) = o(m^k)$ and an absolute constant $C(F, K)$ such that the inequality*

$$T_m(F) \leq h_k(m) + C(F, K) \cdot T_m(K) \tag{4}$$

holds for all deterministic sequences $x_1, \cdots, x_m$. Then the following inequality

$$\mathbb{P}((X_1, \cdots, X_k) \in F) \leq C(F, K) \cdot \mathbb{P}((X_1, \cdots, X_k) \in K). \tag{5}$$

holds for any i.i.d. random variables $X_1, \cdots, X_k$.

Proof. The assumption (4) for any deterministic sequences implies that

$$T_m(X, F) \leq h_k(m) + C(F, K) \cdot T_m(X, K).$$

In particular, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(T_m(X, F)) \leq h_k(m) + C(F, K) \cdot \mathbb{E}(T_m(X, K)). \tag{6}$$

Notice that $T_m(X, F)$ can be written as the summation of Bernoulli random variables with the same distribution

$$T_m(X, F) = \sum 1_{\{(X_{i_1}, \cdots, X_{i_k}) \in F\}}, \tag{7}$$

where the summation is taken over all ordered k-tuples $(i_1, \cdots, i_k)$ with distinct coordinates. Therefore we have

$$\mathbb{E}(T_m(X, F)) = (m)_k \cdot \mathbb{P}((X_1, \cdots, X_k) \in F). \tag{8}$$

where the notation $(m)_k$ stands for the product $m(m-1)\cdots(m-k+1)$. Similarly we have

$$\mathbb{E}(T_m(X,K)) = (m)_k \cdot \mathbb{P}((X_1,\cdots,X_k)\in K). \tag{9}$$

Combining (6), (8) and (9), we have

$$\mathbb{P}((X_1,\cdots,X_k)\in F) \le \frac{h(m)}{(m)_k} + C(F,K)\cdot\mathbb{P}((X_1,\cdots,X_k)\in K).$$

Since m^k and $(m)_k$ have the same order for fixed k and large m, and $h_k(m) = o(m^k)$, the proposition follows by taking the limit $m\to\infty$. □

Although the proof is very simple, let us demonstrate the heuristic reason or intuition behind Proposition 2.1. We will see that the assumption (4) is not artificial and it has to be true if the inequality (5) holds for all distributions. For simplicity, we define $p = \mathbb{P}((X_1,\cdots,X_k)\in F)$. Using the representation (7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{T_m(X,F)}{(m)_k} - p\right)^2 &= \frac{1}{(m)_k^2}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum(1_{\{(X_{i_1},\cdots,X_{i_k})\in F\}} - p)\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{(m)_k^2}\sum\left(\mathbb{E}(1_{\{(X_{i_1},\cdots,X_{i_k})\in F\}}\cdot 1_{\{(X_{i'_1},\cdots,X_{i'_k})\in F\}}) - p^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

If the k-tuples $(i_1,\cdots,i_k)$, $(i'_1,\cdots,i'_k)$ share no common coordinates, it is easy to see that

$$\mathbb{E}(1_{\{(X_{i_1},\cdots,X_{i_k})\in F\}}\cdot 1_{\{(X_{i'_1},\cdots,X_{i'_k})\in F\}}) = p^2.$$

Since there are $o(m^{2k})$ pairs of ordered k-tuples $(i_1,\cdots,i_k)$ and $(i'_1,\cdots,i'_k)$ with common coordinates, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{T_m(X,F)}{(m)_k} - \mathbb{P}((X_1,\cdots,X_k)\in F)\right)^2 \longrightarrow 0, \text{ as } m\to\infty.$$

In particularly, we have

$$\frac{T_m(X,F)}{(m)_k} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbb{P}((X_1,\cdots,X_k)\in F), \text{ as } m\to\infty.$$

We have similar convergence for $T_m(X,K)$. For a fixed random variable X, the inequality (5) will imply

$$T_m(X,F) \le o(m^k) + C(F,K)\cdot T_m(X,K), \ a.s.$$

Therefore, for almost all realizations of $X_1,\cdots,X_m$, i.e. deterministic sequences $x_1,\cdots,x_m$, we will have

$$T_m(F) \le o(m^k) + C(F,K)\cdot T_m(K).$$

We should notice that the outlier sequences depend on the distribution of X and the $o(m^k)$ term may depend on the sequences. However, if the inequality (5) holds for all distributions, it will be reasonable to expect that (4) holds for all deterministic sequences.

3 Small ball inequalities in abelian groups

Let G be a topological group equipped with the Borel σ-algebra (i.e., the σ-algebra generated by the open sets). Let X, Y be i.i.d. random variables taking values in G. A subset of G is said to be *symmetric* if it contains the group inverse of each element of this set. In this section, we assume that G is abelian with the identity 0.

For two subsets $F, K \subseteq G$, their Minkowski sum $F + K$ is defined as

$$F + K = \{x + y : x \in F, y \in K\}.$$

Similarly we can define the difference set $F - K$. The generalized entropy number $N(F, K)$ is defined to be the maximal number of elements we can select from F such that the difference of any two distinct elements does not belong to K. More precisely, we have

$$N(F, K) = \sup\{|S| : S \subseteq F, (S - S) \cap K \subseteq \{0\}\}. \tag{10}$$

Let $T = \{x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_m\}$ be a multi-set (or sequence) of G, i.e. the elements of T are selected from G and are not necessary distinct. For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the quantities $T_+(F, s)$, $T_-(K, s)$ are defined by

$$T_+(F, s) = ms + |\{(i, j) : i \neq j, x_i + x_j \in F\}|, \tag{11}$$

and

$$T_-(K, s) = ms + |\{(i, j) : i \neq j, x_i - x_j \in K\}|. \tag{12}$$

The relation between these two quantities is given in the following lemma, which is similar in spirit to Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 3.2 in [2].

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose K is a symmetric set with $0 \in K$. For $s \geq 2$ and any multi-set T, we have*

$$T_+(F, s) \leq N(F, K) \cdot T_-(K, 2s).$$

Proof. If $N(F, K) = \infty$, the above statement is obviously true. So, we will assume that $N(F, K)$ is finite and prove the lemma by induction on the cardinality of T. When counting the cardinality of a multiset, every element counts even for two elements with the same value. For the base case $|T| = 1$, we have $T_+(F, s) = s$ and $T_-(K, 2s) = 2s$. Since $N(F, K) \geq 1$, it is clear that the lemma has to be true. We assume that the lemma holds for any multi-set T with cardinality $|T| \leq m - 1$. Let t be some non-negative integer such that

$$\max_{x \in T} |(x + K) \cap T| = t + 1.$$

Here we use $(x + K) \cap T$ to denote the multi-set consisting of elements of T which lie in $x + K$. We will use similar notations without further clarification. Let $x^* \in T$ be an element that can achieve the above maximum and we set $T^* = T \backslash \{x^*\}$, where '\' is the standard set subtraction notation. (We only throw x^* away, not other elements with the same value). Since K is a symmetric set containing 0, we have

$$T_-(K, 2s) = T^*_-(K, 2s) + 2s + 2t. \tag{13}$$

We also have

$$T_+(F, s) \leq T^*_+(F, s) + s + 2|(-x^* + F) \cap T|. \tag{14}$$

The definition in (10) implies that we can select at most $N(F,K)$ elements from $(-x^*+F)\cap T$, say $\{y_1, y_2, \cdots, y_k\}$ with $k \le N(F,K)$, such that their mutual differences are not in K. Therefore we have

$$(-x^* + F) \cap T \subseteq \cup_i (y_i + K) \cap T. \tag{15}$$

Combining with (14), we have

$$T_+(F,s) \le T_+^*(F,s) + s + 2(t+1)N(F,K). \tag{16}$$

By the induction assumption, the lemma holds for T^*. Combining (13) and (16), it is not hard to check that the lemma holds when

$$s \ge \frac{2N(F,K)}{2N(F,K)-1},$$

which is implied by the assumption $s \ge 2$. □

By combining Proposition 2.1 with Lemma 3.1, we have the following result.

Theorem 3.1. *Let F and K be measurable subsets of the abelian topological group G. Suppose that K is symmetric and contains the identity of G in its interior. For any i.i.d. random variables X, Y taking values in G, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(X + Y \in F) \le N(F,K) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X - Y \in K).$$

In the following, we study the comparison between $\mathbb{P}(X - Y \in F)$ and $\mathbb{P}(X - Y \in K)$. Let $T_-(F,s)$ be defined the same as (12) with K replaced by F. Similar to Lemma 3.1, we have

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose K is a symmetric set with $0 \in K$. For $s \ge 2$ and any multi-set T, we have*

$$T_-(F,s) \le (1 + N(F\backslash K, K)) \cdot T_-(K, 2s).$$

Proof. We only need to make a slight modification of the proof of Lemma 3.1. Let x^* be chosen in the same way as before and we set $T^* = T\backslash\{x^*\}$. It is clear that the equation (13) still holds. Instead of (14), we have

$$T_-(F,s) \le T_-^*(F,s) + s + |((x^* + F) \cap T)\backslash\{x^*\}| + |((x^* - F) \cap T)\backslash\{x^*\}|.$$

Notice the following set-inclusion relations

$$(x^* + F) \subseteq (x^* + K) \cup (x^* + F\backslash K),$$

and

$$(x^* - F) \subseteq (x^* + K) \cup (x^* - F\backslash K).$$

We use the symmetry assumption of K in the second inclusion relation. Applying the covering argument (15) again to $x^* + F\backslash K$ and $x^* - F\backslash K$, we have

$$T_-(F,s) \le T_-^*(F,s) + s + 2t + 2(t+1)N(F\backslash K, K). \tag{17}$$

Combining (13) and (17), for $s \ge 2$, we will have

$$T_-(F,s) \le (1 + N(F\backslash K, K)) \cdot T_-(K, 2s).$$

So we complete the proof of the lemma. □

By combining Proposition 2.1 with Lemma 3.2, we have the following result.

Theorem 3.2. *Let F and K be measurable subsets of the abelian topological group G. Suppose that K is symmetric and contains the identity of G in its interior. For any i.i.d. random variables X, Y taking values in G, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(X - Y \in F) \leq (1 + (F \backslash K, K)) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X - Y \in K).$$

We include the following result of Katona [31] as another application of the combinatorial argument, which is related to Turán's theorem for triangle-free graphs. We formulate Katona's proof in the following way, and while we provide a proof for completeness, we do not claim any novelty here.

Theorem 3.3 (Katona [31])**.** *Let X, Y be i.i.d. random variables taking values in a Hilbert space V with the norm $\|\cdot\|$. Then we have*

$$(\mathbb{P}(\|X\| \geq 1))^2 \leq 2\mathbb{P}(\|X + Y\| \geq 1).$$

Proof. Let $F, K \subseteq V \times V$ be the subsets defined by

$$F = \{(x, y) : \|x\| \geq 1, \|y\| \geq 1\},$$

and

$$K = \{(x, y) : \|x + y\| \geq 1\}.$$

Given a multi-set $T = \{x_1, \cdots, x_m\}$ of V, we define

$$T_m(F) = |\{(i, j) : i \neq j, (x_i, x_j) \in F\}|,$$

and

$$T_m(K) = |\{(i, j) : i \neq j, (x_i, x_j) \in K\}|.$$

By Proposition 2.1, the theorem will hold if we can show that

$$T_m(F) \leq 2(m + T_m(K)). \tag{18}$$

Suppose that there are n elements of T with norms not less than 1. Then we have

$$T_m(F) = n^2 - n. \tag{19}$$

Let us consider a simple graph G on these n elements. (The notation G should not be confused with the notation used for group. For any two elements, we always think them as different vertices even if they have the same value). Two vertices x, y are adjacent if and only if $\|x + y\| \geq 1$. Then we have

$$T_m(K) \geq 2e(G), \tag{20}$$

where $e(G)$ is the number of edges of G. For any 3 vertices x, y, z, there exists at least a pair, say x, y, such that the angle between them is no more than $2\pi/3$, which implies that $\|x + y\| \geq 1$. This fact implies that the complementary graph is triangle free. Using Turán's theorem, we have

$$e(G) \geq \binom{n}{2} - \frac{n^2}{4}. \tag{21}$$

Then the estimate (18) follows from (19), (20) and (21). □

Remark 3.3. *The above argument was used by Katona to prove the theorem for discrete random variables. Then Katona made the extension for continuous random variables using continuous versions of Turán-type theorems. Similar ideas are used in a series of papers [31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37] on the study of the optimal estimate of* $\mathbb{P}(\|X+Y\| \geq c)$ *in terms of* $\mathbb{P}(\|X\| \geq 1)$ *for i.i.d. random variables. Comprehensive results are given in the survey [38]. Similar results were independently obtained by Sidorenko [62].*

Question 3.4. *Proposition 2.1 provides a combinatorial argument for the comparison of two probabilities of the same magnitude, i.e. one can be bounded by the other one linearly. A general question is that do we have a similar approach when the probabilities are of different magnitudes. In another word, can we establish the combinatorial analogue for the following distribution-free inequality*

$$\mathbb{P}((X_1, \cdots, X_k) \in F) \leq f(\mathbb{P}(X_1, \cdots, X_l) \in K),$$

where f *is certain function, not necessary linear. Theorem 3.3 is a particular example in this flavor.*

At this moment we do not know if extensions of Katona's result hold in general Banach spaces. Using the combinatorial argument, we can prove the following symmetrization result.

Theorem 3.4. *Let* F, K *be measurable subsets of an abelian group* G*. Suppose that* K *is symmetric and contains the identity of* G *in its interior. For any* G*-valued i.i.d. random variables* X, Y*, we have*

$$(\mathbb{P}(X \in F))^2 \leq N(F,K) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X - Y \in K).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.1. We can assume that $N(F,K)$ is finite. For a multiset $T = \{x_1, \cdots, x_m\}$ of G, we define

$$T(F) = |\{(i,j) : i \neq j, x_i \in F, x_j \in F\}|,$$

and

$$T_-(K) = (N(F,K))^2 + 2m + |\{(i,j) : i \neq j, x_i - x_j \in K\}|.$$

Then we need to prove the following combinatorial counterpart of the theorem

$$T(F) \leq N(F,K) \cdot T_-(K). \tag{22}$$

We will prove it by induction on m. It is clear that the statement holds for $m \leq N(F,K)$. Without of loss of generality, we can assume that $x_i \in F$ for all $x_i \in T$. Let t, x^*, T^* be defined in the same way as in Lemma 3.1. By the definition of $N(F,K)$ in (10), we can select at most $N(F,K)$ elements of T with mutual differences not contained by K. The pigeon-hole principle implies

$$t + 1 \geq \frac{m}{N(F,K)}.$$

It is not hard to see that

$$T(F) = m^2 - m = T^*(F) + 2(m-1), \tag{23}$$

and

$$T_-(K) = T^*_-(K) + 2t + 2 \geq T^*_-(K) + \frac{2m}{N(F,K)}. \tag{24}$$

Then the estimate (22) follows from (23), (24) and the induction assumption on T^*. □

Corollary 3.5. *Let a, b be positive numbers. For any i.i.d. real-valued random variables X, Y, we have*

$$(\mathbb{P}(|X| \leq b))^2 \leq \lceil 2b/a \rceil \cdot \mathbb{P}(|X - Y| \leq a).$$

Moreover the estimate can not be improved.

The proof follows by taking $F = [-b, b]$ and $K = [-a, a]$ and elementary geometric covering argument. The tightness of the estimate can be seen from the case when X is uniformly distributed on the set $\{-b, -b + (1+\epsilon)a, \cdots, -b + (\lceil 2b/a \rceil - 1)(1+\epsilon)a\}$ for some small $\epsilon > 0$.

4 Small ball inequalities in non-abelian groups

In this section, we let G be an arbitrary topological group with the identity e. We will show that Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 still hold for certain measurable sets F, K in this general setting. Similar to the sumset $F + K$ in the abelian case, we define the product set $F \cdot K$ in this non-abelian setting as

$$F \cdot K = \{xy : x \in F, y \in K\}.$$

The entropy number $N(F, K)$ is redefined as

$$N(F, K) = \sup\{|S| : S \subseteq F, (S \cdot S^{-1}) \cap K \subseteq \{e\}\}, \tag{25}$$

where S^{-1} is the set of all inverses of the elements of S. For $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and a multi-set $T = \{x_1, \cdots, x_m\}$, the quantities $T_+(F, s)$, $T_-(K, s)$ are redefined by

$$T_+(F, s) = ms + |\{(i, j) : i \neq j, x_i x_j \in F\}|, \tag{26}$$

and

$$T_-(K, s) = ms + |\{(i, j) : i \neq j, x_i x_j^{-1} \in K\}|. \tag{27}$$

Similar to Lemma 3.1, we have the following result.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose K is a normal subgroup of G. For $s \geq 2$ and any multi-set T, we have*

$$T_+(F, s) \leq N(F, K) \cdot T_-(K, 2s).$$

Proof. The lemma can be proved with a slight modification of the proof of Lemma 3.1. In order to see how the assumption of K is used, we write the proof again. Let t be some non-negative integer such that

$$\max_{x \in T} |(xK) \cap T| = t + 1,$$

where xK is the set of the products of x and the elements of K. Let x^* be an element such that the maximum can achieved and $T^* = T \backslash \{x^*\}$. By the definition of $T_-(K, 2s)$, we have

$$T_-(K, 2s) = T_-^*(K, 2s) + 2s + |((Kx^*) \cap T) \backslash \{x^*\}| + |((x^* K^{-1}) \cap T) \backslash \{x^*\}|$$

Since K is a normal subgroup, the estimate of $T_-(K, 2s)$ in (13) still holds. Similar to (14), we have

$$T_+(F, s) \leq T_+^*(F, s) + s + |((x^*)^{-1} F) \cap T| + |(F(x^*)^{-1}) \cap T|.$$

Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in F$ be any two elements, and $u_1 = (x^*)^{-1}\alpha_1$, $u_2 = (x^*)^{-1}\alpha_2$. Since K is a normal subgroup, we can see that $u_1 u_2^{-1} \in K$ if only if $\alpha_1\alpha_2^{-1} \in K$. (The assumption that K is a normal subgroup is important here). By the definition of $N(F, K)$ in (25), we can select at most $N(F, K)$ elements from $((x^*)^{-1}F)) \cap T$, say $\{y_1, \cdots, y_k\}$, such that $y_i y_j^{-1} \notin K$ for any $y_i \neq y_j$. Then we have the following covering relation

$$((x^*)^{-1}F) \cap T \subseteq \cup_i (y_i K) \cap T,$$

which implies

$$|((x^*)^{-1}F) \cap T| \leq (t+1)N(F, K).$$

Similarly we have the same estimate for $|(F(x^*)^{-1}) \cap T|$. Then we can see that the estimate of $T_+(F, s)$ is exactly the same as (16). So we proved the lemma. □

Using Proposition 2.1 together with Lemma 4.1, we have the following result.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that K is a normal subgroup of the topological group G and the interior of K contains the identity element. For any i.i.d. random variables X, Y taking values in G, and any measurable subset F of G, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(XY \in F) \leq N(F, K) \cdot \mathbb{P}(XY^{-1} \in K).$$

The following lemma can be proved in the same way as Lemma 3.2. Thus we omit its proof.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose $K \subseteq G$ is a normal subgroup. For $s \geq 2$ and any multi-set T, we have*

$$T_-(F, s) \leq (1 + N(F \backslash K, K)) \cdot T_-(K, 2s).$$

Combining with Proposition 2.1, we have the following result.

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose that K is a normal subgroup of the topological group G and the interior of K contains the identity element. For any i.i.d. random variables X, Y taking values in G, and any measurable subset F of G, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(XY^{-1} \in F) \leq (1 + N(F \backslash K, K)) \cdot \mathbb{P}(XY^{-1} \in K).$$

5 Small ball inequalities in topological vector spaces

Let V be a topological vector space over a field $\mathbb{F}$ with the Borel σ-algebra generated by all open sets. Let $F, K \subseteq V$ be measurable subsets and let $a, b \in \mathbb{F}$. Then we can consider the comparison between $\mathbb{P}(aX + bY \in F)$ and $\mathbb{P}(X - Y \in K)$ for i.i.d. random variables X, Y taking values in V.

Theorem 5.1. *Let F, K be measurable subsets of a topological vector space V over a field $\mathbb{F}$. Suppose that K is symmetric and contains the zero vector in its interior. Let a, b be non-zero elements of $\mathbb{F}$. For any i.i.d. random variables X, Y taking values in V, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(aX + bY \in F) \leq N(a, b, F, K) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X - Y \in K),$$

where the constant $N(a, b, F, K)$ is defined by

$$N(a, b, F, K) = \frac{1}{2}\left(N(a^{-1}F, K) + N(b^{-1}F, K)\right).$$

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as that of Theorem 3.1. Let $T = \{x_1, \cdots, x_m\}$ be a multi-set of V. For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$T_+(F, s, a, b) = ms + |\{(i, j) : i \neq j, ax_i + bx_j \in F\}|.$$

By Proposition 2.1, we only need to prove the following combinatorial analogue

$$T_+(F, s, a, b) \leq N(a, b, F, K) \cdot T_-(K, 2s) \tag{28}$$

for $s \geq 2$, where $T_-(K, 2s)$ is defined the same as (12). We choose x^* in the same way as in Lemma 3.1 and set $T^* = T \setminus \{x^*\}$. The estimate of $T_-(K, 2s)$ in (13) still holds. Similar to (14), we have

$$T_+(F, s, a, b) \leq T^*_+(F, s, a, b) + s + |(-b^{-1}ax^* + b^{-1}F) \cap T| + |(-a^{-1}bx^* + a^{-1}F) \cap T|.$$

Applying the covering argument (15) to $-b^{-1}ax^* + b^{-1}F$, and using the definition of $N(b^{-1}F, K)$, we will have

$$|(-b^{-1}ax^* + b^{-1}F) \cap T| \leq (t + 1)N(b^{-1}F, K).$$

Similarly we can see that

$$|(-a^{-1}bx^* + a^{-1}F) \cap T| \leq (t + 1)N(a^{-1}F, K).$$

Thus we have

$$T_+(F, s, a, b) \leq T^*_+(F, s, a, b) + s + 2(t + 1)N(a, b, F, K). \tag{29}$$

Then the estimate (28) follows from (13) and (29). So we complete the proof. □

As a special case of Theorem 5.1, the following result considers the comparison between $\mathbb{P}(|aX+bY| \leq c)$ and $\mathbb{P}(|X-Y| \leq d)$ for real-valued i.i.d. random variables. That generalizes the estimates (2) and (3).

Corollary 5.1. *Let a, b, c, d be non-zero real numbers and $c, d > 0$. For any real-valued i.i.d. random variables X, Y, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(|aX + bY| \leq c) \leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\left\lceil \frac{2c}{|a|d} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{2c}{|b|d} \right\rceil\right) \mathbb{P}(|X - Y| \leq d).$$

Proof. We can take $F = [-c, c]$ and $K = [-d, d]$. Elementary geometric argument will yield

$$N(a^{-1}F, K) = \left\lceil \frac{2c}{|a|d} \right\rceil, \quad N(b^{-1}F, K) = \left\lceil \frac{2c}{|b|d} \right\rceil.$$

Then the result follows from Theorem 5.1. □

Remark 5.2. *If $a = b$, we can see that Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.1 match Theorem 3.1 and (3), respectively. However, for $a = -b$, Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.1 are weaker than Theorem 3.2 and (2), respectively. This is due to the subtle difference between the covering arguments used in the proofs. The case when $a = 0$ or $b = 0$ is covered by Corollary 3.5.*

6 Discussion of tightness

In this section, we study the near extremal distributions for the probabilistic estimates developed in previous sections. The discussion will mainly focus on Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 for random variables taking values in the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$. We will see their close connections with the sphere packing problem in geometry.

In general it is hard to compute the ratio of $\mathbb{P}(X \pm Y) \in F$ and $\mathbb{P}(X - Y) \in K$. If X, Y are assumed to be uniformly distributed on a finite set $T = \{x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n\}$, then we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X \pm Y \in F) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |(\mp x_i + F) \cap T|,$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(X - Y \in K) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |(x_i + K) \cap T|.$$

If the set T is K-separated, i.e. $x_i - x_j \notin K$ for $i \neq j$, we will have $|(x_i + K) \cap T| = 1$ for all $x_i \in T$. We can even make a further assumption that, except $o(n)$ of them, all the sets $\mp x_i + F$ contain the same number of elements of T. This is possible if T is selected to consist of certain lattice points. (So the random variables X, Y need to be in a topological vector space V). Under these assumptions, we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(X \pm Y \in F)}{\mathbb{P}(X - Y \in K)} \to \max_{x \in T} |(\mp x + F) \cap T|, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Then the estimate in Theorem 3.1 is tight if there exists a K-separated lattice $\mathcal{L}$ and a point $x \in V$ (not necessary a lattice point) such that $x + F$ contains $N(F, K)$ points of $\mathcal{L}$. We can take the support set T as the union of a subset of $\mathcal{L}$ and the reflection of this subset after certain shift. Similarly, Theorem 3.2 is tight if for every lattice point $x \in \mathcal{L}$ the set $x + (F \backslash K)$ contains $N(F \backslash K, K)$ points of $\mathcal{L}$. In this case, we only need to take T to be certain subset of the lattice $\mathcal{L}$. This idea can be used to produce near optimal examples for the estimates (3) and (2). For the estimate (3), we can take X to be uniformly distributed on $\{-(n-1)\delta - r, \cdots, -\delta - r, \delta, 2\delta, \cdots, n\delta\}$, where $r > 0$ and $\delta > a$. For any a, b, we can always choose appropriate parameters r, δ such that the ratio $\mathbb{P}(|X + Y| \leq b)/\mathbb{P}(|X - Y| \leq a)$ will approach $\lceil 2b/a \rceil$ as $n \to \infty$. This example is essentially the same as the one given in [18]. To see the sharpness of (2), we can take X to be uniformly distributed on $\{\delta, 2\delta, \cdots, n\delta\}$ for certain $\delta > a$, which was given in [2].

In the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$, let us take F and K to be closed balls centered at the origin of radius r and 1, respectively. For simplicity, we use $N_+(r)$ and $N_-(r)$ to denote $N(F, K)$ and $N(F \backslash K, K) + 1$, respectively. Then $N_+(r)$ represents the maximal number of points in a Euclidean ball of radius r with all mutual distances greater than 1. For $N_-(r)$ we put an extra restriction that one of these points should be at the center of the ball. These are the so-called sphere packing problems. The dual problem of $N_+(r)$ asks for the smallest radius of the ball to contain n points with mutual distances at least 1. We use $r_+(n)$ to denote this quantity. (Notice that they are not exactly dual to each other, since in the definition of $r_+(n)$ the mutual distances can be equal to 1). Similarly we can define $r_-(n)$ with the restriction that one of the points should be at the center of the ball.

For $d = 2$, instead of the radius function $r_+(n)$, Bateman and Erdős [4] studied the diameters of the extremal configurations of points. Using their results, we can get the corresponding radius function $r_+(n)$. Using the duality, we list the values of $N_+(r)$ for r in certain

range.

$$N_+(r) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } 0 < r \le 1/2 \\ 2, & \text{if } 1/2 < r \le \sqrt{3}/3 \\ 3, & \text{if } \sqrt{3}/3 < r \le \sqrt{2}/2 \\ 4, & \text{if } \sqrt{2}/2 < r \le \frac{1}{2}\csc(\pi/5) \\ 5, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2}\csc(\pi/5) < r \le 1 \\ 7, & \text{if } 1 < r \le 1+\epsilon, \text{ small } \epsilon > 0. \end{cases}$$

Since the extremal configurations given by Bateman and Erdős are lattice points, the listed values of $N_+(r)$ are tight for Theorem 3.1. It is not hard to see that $r_-(2) = \cdots = r_-(7) = 1$ with one point at the center of a unit circle and the rest points on this circle. Bateman and Erdős also gave the values of $r_-(n)$ for $n = 8, 9, 10, 11$. Then we can get a list of values of $N_-(r)$.

$$N_-(r) = \begin{cases} 7, & \text{if } 1 < r \le \frac{1}{2}\csc(\pi/7) \\ 8, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2}\csc(\pi/7) < r \le \frac{1}{2}\csc(\pi/8) \\ 9, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2}\csc(\pi/8) < r \le \frac{1}{2}\csc(\pi/9) \\ 10, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2}\csc(\pi/9) < r \le \frac{1}{2}\csc(\pi/10). \end{cases}$$

which are tight for Theorem 3.2.

For the sphere packing problems in $\mathbb{R}^d$, people are generally interested in the optimal packing density ρ_d. When r is large, it is not hard to see the following asymptotic estimate

$$N_+(r) \approx N_-(r) = (1+o(1))\frac{\mathrm{vol}(B(r))}{\mathrm{vol}(B(1/2))}\rho_d = (1+o(1))(2r)^d\rho_d.$$

In $\mathbb{R}^2$, it is known that hexagonal lattice packing is optimal among all packings (not necessary lattice packings) with packing density $\rho_2 = \sqrt{3}\pi/6 \approx 0.9069$. The sphere packing problem in three-dimensional Euclidean space has a long history. Kepler conjectured in 1611 that no arrangement of equally sized spheres can fill the space with a greater average density than that of the face-centered cubic and hexagonal close packing arrangements. The density of these arrangements is $\sqrt{2}\pi/6 \approx 0.7404$. Gauss proved in 1831 that Kepler's conjecture is true if the spheres have to be arranged in a regular lattice. The complete proof of Kepler's conjecture was announced only around 20 years ago by Hales (see, e.g., [26]), and a formal verification using automated proof checking was only completed in 2014. In the very recent breakthrough work [64], Viazovskait proved that the E_8 lattice packing gives the optimal packing density in dimension 8, and the density is $\rho_8 = \pi^4/384 \approx 0.025367$. Building on Viazovskait's work, it is shown in [13] that Leech lattice packing is optimal in 24 dimension, and the packing density is $\rho_{24} = \pi^{12}/12! \approx 0.00193$.

Another interesting problem related to our study is the kissing number problem. In three dimensions it asks how many billiard balls can be arranged so that they all just touch another billiard ball of the same size. This question was a subject of a famous debate between Isaac Newton and David Gregory in 1690's. Newton believed the answer was 12, while Gregory though that 13 might be possible. Generally we can define the d-dimensional kissing number τ_d as the maximal number of points on the unit sphere with Euclidean distances at least 1. For $1 < r < 1 + \epsilon_d$ with small $\epsilon_d > 0$, it is not hard to see the following relation

$$N_-(r) = \tau_d + 1. \tag{30}$$

The number $\tau_3 = 12$ was studied by various researchers in the nineteenth century. The best proof now available is due to Leech [43]. The answers $\tau_8 = 240$ and $\tau_{24} = 196,560$ are given by [58] and [44], respectively. It is somewhat surprising that they are technically easier to establish than τ_3. The correct answer $\tau_4 = 24$ was obtained much later by Musin [56]. For all these results, the extremal configurations follows from lattice packings. Using the relation (30), Theorem 3.2 can give explicit tight estimates for r slightly greater than 1 in corresponding dimensions. These are all the known values of the kissing number so far. In high dimensions, τ_d grows exponentially with unknown base. We refer to the monograph [14] for more discussions of sphere packing problems and their relations with number theory and coding theory.

7 Applications

In the following we study applications of the probabilistic estimates developed in previous sections in probability concentration functions and some moment inequalities.

7.1 Concentration function

Let G be a topological abelian group and let $F \subseteq G$ be a measurable subset. For a random variable X taking values in G, the generalized Lévy's concentration function $Q(X, F)$ is defined to be

$$Q(X, F) = \sup_{x \in G} \mathbb{P}(X \in x + F). \tag{31}$$

The main study of concentration function is devoted to the sum of independent random variables in Banach spaces with F taken to be normed balls, see [27, 29, 55]. In the i.i.d. case, Theorem 3.1 can provide us a symmetrization technique to treat different sets and also general groups where no norm may exist.

For a random variable X, we use $\widetilde{X}$ to denote the symmetrized random variable $X - Y$, where Y is an independent copy of X.

Theorem 7.1. *Let G be an topological abelian group, and let K be a symmetric measurable subset of G such that the interior of K contains the identity of G. For any independent (not necessarily identical) random variables $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ taking values in G, and any measurable subset F of G, we have*

$$(Q(X_1 + \cdots + X_n, F))^2 \le N(F + F, K) \cdot Q(\widetilde{X}_1 + \cdots + \widetilde{X}_n, K). \tag{32}$$

If $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ also have identical distribution, then we have

$$Q(X_1 + \cdots + X_n, F) \le N(F, K) \cdot Q(\widetilde{X}_1 + \cdots + \widetilde{X}_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}, K). \tag{33}$$

Proof. By the definition of generalized Lévy's concentration function (31), for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$, there exists $x \in G$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
(Q(X_1 + \cdots + X_n, F))^2 &\le (\mathbb{P}(X_1 + \cdots + X_n \in x + F) + \epsilon)^2 \\
&\le \mathbb{P}(X_1 + \cdots + X_n \in x + F) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X_1' + \cdots + X_n' \in x + F) + 3\epsilon \\
&\le \mathbb{P}(X_1 + \cdots + X_n + X_1' \cdots + X_n' \in 2x + F + F) + 3\epsilon \\
&\le N(F + F, K) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X_1 - X_1' + \cdots + X_n - X_n', K) + 3\epsilon \\
&\le N(F + F, K) \cdot Q(\widetilde{X}_1 + \cdots + \widetilde{X}_n, K) + 3\epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

where $(X_1', \cdots, X_n')$ is an independent copy of $(X_1, \cdots, X_n)$, and the 2nd last inequality follows from Theorem 3.1. Then (32) follows by letting $\epsilon \to 0$. To prove (33), it is not hard to see that for independent random variables X, Y,

$$Q(X+Y, F) \leq Q(X, F).$$

Therefore we have

$$Q(X_1 + \cdots + X_n, F) \leq Q(X_1 + \cdots + X_{2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}, F)$$

Similarly we can select $x \in G$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} Q(X_1 + \cdots + X_{2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}, F) &\leq \mathbb{P}(X_1 + \cdots + X_{2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \in x + F) + \epsilon \\ &\leq N(F, K) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X_1 - X_2 + \cdots + X_{2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1} - X_{2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \in K) + \epsilon \\ &\leq N(F, K) \cdot Q(\widetilde{X}_1 + \cdots + \widetilde{X}_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}, K) + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

In the 2nd inequality we use Theorem 3.1, and (33) follows by letting $\epsilon \to 0$. □

If F, K are taken to be balls of vanishing radius in a metrizable, locally compact abelian group, then Theorem 7.1 will yield (under appropriate conditions) an inequality relating the essential supremums of the densities of $X+Y$ and $X-Y$. This may be interpreted as relating the Rényi entropies of order ∞ of $X+Y$ and $X-Y$.

Let f be a real or complex valued locally integrable function over a metric space with certain reference measure μ. We say that x is a Lebesgue point of f if

$$\lim_{r \to 0} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x,r))} \int_{B(x,r)} f(y) d\mu(y) = f(x),$$

where $B(x, r)$ is the ball of radius r centered at x.

For a random variable X with density f. Its Rényi entropy of order ∞ is defined to be

$$h_\infty(X) = -\log \|f\|_\infty,$$

where $\|f\|_\infty$ is the essential supremum of f.

Theorem 7.2. *Let G be a metrizable, locally compact abelian group with Haar measure μ. Suppose the following two conditions hold:*
(1) For any locally integrable function, almost every point of G is a Lebesgue point.
(2) We have $\limsup_{r \to 0} N(B_r, B_r) < \infty$, where B_r is the ball of radius r centered at the identity of G.
Then for any i.i.d. absolute continuous random variables X, Y in G we have

$$h_\infty(X+Y) - h_\infty(X-Y) \geq \log(\limsup_{r \to 0} N(B_r, B_r))$$

Proof. It is clear that $X+Y$ and $X-Y$ are also absolute continuous random variables. We denote by f_{X+Y} and f_{X-Y} the densities of $X+Y$ and $X-Y$, respectively, with respect to the Haar measure μ. We let $\|f_{X+Y}\|_\infty$ and $\|f_{X-Y}\|_\infty$ be the essential supremums of f_{X+Y} and f_{X-Y}, respectively. We consider the following two possible cases.
Case 1: $\|f_{X+Y}\|_\infty < \infty$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we can find a Lebesgue point of f_{X+Y}, say $z \in G$, such that

$$f_{X+Y}(z) \geq \|f_{X+Y}\|_\infty - \epsilon.$$

The existence of such a point is due to the first assumption. Since z is a Lebesgue point, when $r > 0$ is small, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B(z,r)} f_{X+Y}(w)d\mu(w) &\geq (f_{X+Y}(z) - \epsilon)\mu(B(z,r)) \\ &\geq (\|f_{X+Y}\|_\infty - 2\epsilon)\mu(B_r).\end{aligned}$$

In the 2nd inequality we used the invariant property of Haar measure: $\mu(B(z,r) = \mu(B_r)$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B(z,r)} f_{X+Y}(w)d\mu(w) &\leq Q(X+Y, B_r) \\ &\leq N(B_r, B_r)Q(X-Y, B_r) \\ &\leq N(B_r, B_r)\|f_{X-Y}\|_\infty \mu(B_r).\end{aligned}$$

The 2nd inequality follows from Theorem 7.1. So we have

$$\|f_{X+Y}\|_\infty - 2\epsilon \leq N(B_r, B_r)\|f_{X-Y}\|_\infty.$$

As $\epsilon \to 0$, we will have

$$\|f_{X+Y}\|_\infty \leq \limsup_{r\to 0} N(B_r, B_r) \cdot \|f_{X-Y}\|_\infty,$$

which is equivalent to the desired result.
Case 2: $\|f_{X+Y}\|_\infty = \infty$. Similarly for any $M > 0$, we can find a Lebesgue point of f_{X+Y}, say $z \in G$, such that

$$f_{X+Y}(z) \geq M.$$

For any $\epsilon > 0$, we can apply the same argument to show that for small r

$$M - \epsilon \leq N(B_r, B_r)\|f_{X-Y}\|_\infty.$$

It is clear that $N(B_r, B_r) \geq 1$. Since M can be arbitrarily large, we have

$$\|f_{X-Y}\|_\infty = \infty.$$

In this case the result trivially holds. □

Remark 7.1. *For the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$, the first assumption follows from Lebesgue's differentiation theorem and the second assumption trivially holds since $N(B_r, B_r)$ is independent of the radius r. For $d = 1$ we know that $N(B_r, B_r) = 2$. Therefore for real-valued i.i.d. random variables X, Y we have*

$$h_\infty(X+Y) - h_\infty(X-Y) \geq \log 2.$$

This is somewhat surprising, since such a result does not hold for Rényi entropies of order 0 and 1. Indeed, the comparison of $h_p(X+Y)$ and $h_p(X-Y)$ for $p = 0, 1$ is closely related to the study of more-sums-than-differences sets in additive combinatorics. This is discussed in [1], where it is also shown that $h_1(X+Y) - h_1(X-Y)$ can be made to take any real value if X, Y are identically distributed on the real line.

In particular, if G is some topological vector space, Theorem 5.1 can be used to study concentration functions of linear combinations of i.i.d. random variables.

Theorem 7.3. *Let F, K be measurable subsets of a topological vector space V over a field $\mathbb{F}$. Suppose that K is symmetric and contains the zero vector in its interior. Let a, b be non-zero elements of $\mathbb{F}$. For any i.i.d. random variables X, Y taking values in V, we have*

$$Q(aX + bY, F) \leq N(a, b, F, K) \cdot Q(X - Y, K).$$

Proof. By the definition of generalized Lévy's concentration function (31), for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $x \in V$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} Q(aX + bY, F) &< \mathbb{P}(aX + bY \in x + F) + \epsilon \\ &\leq N(a, b, F, K) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X - Y \in K) + \epsilon \\ &\leq N(a, b, F, K) \cdot Q(X - Y, K) + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

In the 2nd inequality we use Theorem 5.1. Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, the statement follows by letting $\epsilon \to 0$. □

Remark 7.2. *It is natural to consider possible extensions of the result for more than 2 i.i.d. random variables. For instance, it is an interesting question to study the variation of (33) with the left hand side replaced by $Q(a_1X_1 + \cdots + a_nX_n, F)$, when $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ take values in a vector space and $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ are arbitrary coefficients in a field. Such questions are related to the Littlewood-Offord phenomenon (see, e.g., [57, 52]). The simplest manifestation of the latter is the fact that when X_i are Bernoulli random variables taking values 0 and 1 with equal probability, and $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ are positive integers, then $Q(a_1X_1 + \cdots + a_nX_n, \frac{1}{2}) \leq Q(X_1 + \cdots + X_n, \frac{1}{2}) = O(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$. Moreover, when the sequence of coefficients is not allowed to have additive structure (for example, if they are forced to be distinct), the asymptotic behavior of the concentration function changes (becomes $O(n^{-\frac{3}{2}})$). While there is a long history of work in this direction as surveyed for example in [57, 19], it would be very interesting to understand these questions better in general settings, particularly by identifying extremal coefficients, which are only known in very few cases.*

7.2 Hölder-type inequalities

Let V be a vector space over the complex field $\mathbb{C}$. Let $\varphi = \|\cdot\|_1$ and $\phi = \|\cdot\|_2$ be two equivalent norms on V and let $I : (V, \|\cdot\|_1) \to (V, \|\cdot\|_2)$ be the identity operator. Its norm $\|I\|$ is defined in the usual way

$$\|I\| = \sup_{\|x\|_1 = 1} \|x\|_2.$$

Let $B_1(r)$, $B_2(r)$ be the closed balls centered at the origin of radius r under the gauges $\|\cdot\|_1$, $\|\cdot\|_2$, respectively. Then it is not hard to see the following geometric interpretation of $\|I\|$:

$$\|I\| = \inf\{r > 0 : B_1(1) \subseteq B_2(r)\}. \tag{34}$$

Theorem 7.4. *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ be non-zero complex numbers, and let $q \geq p$ be real numbers such that $pq > 0$. For any i.i.d. random variables X, Y taking values in V, we have*

$$\left(\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|_2^p\right)^{1/p} \leq 2\|I\| \max\left\{|a|^{-1}, |b|^{-1}\right\} \cdot \left(\mathbb{E}\|aX + bY\|_1^q\right)^{1/q}. \tag{35}$$

Proof. We assume that the right hand side of (35) is finite. Otherwise the theorem yields a trivial result. By Hölder's inequality, we only need to prove the theorem for $q = p$. For $p > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|aX + bY\|_1^p &= p\int_0^\infty t^{p-1}\mathbb{P}(\|aX + bY\|_1 > t)dt \\ &= p\int_0^\infty t^{p-1}\left(1 - \mathbb{P}(\|aX + bY\|_1 \le t)\right)dt.\end{aligned}$$

By the geometric interpretation (34) of $\|I\|$ and Theorem 5.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\|aX + bY\|_1 \le t) &\le \mathbb{P}(\|aX + bY\|_2 \le t\|I\|) \\ &\le \mathbb{P}(\|X - Y\|_2 \le Ct),\end{aligned}$$

where the constant $C = 2\|I\|\max\left\{|a|^{-1}, |b|^{-1}\right\}$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|aX + bY\|_1^p &\ge p\int_0^\infty t^{p-1}\left(1 - \mathbb{P}(\|X - Y\|_2 \le Ct)\right)dt \\ &= p\int_0^\infty t^{p-1}\mathbb{P}(\|X - Y\|_2 > Ct)dt \\ &= C^{-p}\cdot\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|_2^p,\end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the estimate (35) for $p = q$. For $p < 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|aX + bY\|_1^p &= -p\int_0^\infty t^{-p-1}\mathbb{P}(\|aX + bY\|_1 \le t^{-1})dt \\ &\le -p\int_0^\infty t^{-p-1}\mathbb{P}(\|aX + bY\|_2 \le \|I\|t^{-1})dt \\ &\le -p\int_0^\infty t^{-p-1}\mathbb{P}(\|X - Y\|_2 \le Ct^{-1})dt \\ &= C^{-p}\left(-p\int_0^\infty t^{-p-1}\mathbb{P}(\|X - Y\|_2 \le t^{-1})dt\right) \\ &= C^{-p}\cdot\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|_2^p\end{aligned}$$

In the first and second inequalities, we use the geometric interpretation of $\|I\|$ and Theorem 5.1, respectively. We will get (35) by taking the $1/p$-th root of both sides. □

The following result is an immediate consequence of the above theorem.

Corollary 7.3. *Let $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed vector space over the complex field $\mathbb{C}$. For any i.i.d. random variables X, Y taking values in V, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\| \le 2\mathbb{E}\|X + Y\|, \tag{36}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\|X + Y\|^{-1} \le 2\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|^{-1}.$$

For $p > 2$, Buja, et al [9] constructed an example such that

$$\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|_p > \mathbb{E}\|X + Y\|_p,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_p$ is the l^p norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$. But the ratio is a little bit greater than 1. So we do not know whether the estimate (36) is tight. Let p, r be positive numbers such that $0 < \gamma \le p \le 2$, $1 \le p \le 2$. For $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued i.i.d. random variables X, Y, Buja, et al [9] also proved that

$$\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|_p^\gamma \le \mathbb{E}\|X + Y\|_p^\gamma.$$

Another related result proved by Mattner [54] is that for $0 < \gamma \le 2$ and any orthogonal map T on $\mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|^\gamma \le \mathbb{E}\|X - TY\|^\gamma,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm.

We call a function $\varphi : V \to \mathbb{R}$ unimodal if the super-level set $\{x \in V : \varphi(x) \ge t\}$ is convex for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 7.5. *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ be non-zero complex numbers and let φ be a non-negative symmetric unimodal function on V. For any i.i.d. random variables X, Y taking values in V, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\varphi(aX + bY) \le \mathbb{E}\varphi\left(\frac{X - Y}{2\max\{|a|^{-1}, |b|^{-1}\}}\right).$$

Proof. Since φ is non-negative, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\varphi(aX + bY) &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(\varphi(aX + bY) > t\right) dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(aX + bY \in \varphi^{-1}(t, \infty))dt\end{aligned}$$

where we use $\varphi^{-1}(t, \infty)$ to denote the set $\{x \in V : \varphi(x) > t\}$. Since φ is a symmetric unimodal function, we can see that $\varphi^{-1}(t, \infty)$ is a symmetric convex set. Using Theorem 5.1, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(aX + bY \in \varphi^{-1}(t, \infty)) \le \mathbb{P}\left(X - Y \in 2\max\{|a|^{-1}, |b|^{-1}\}\varphi^{-1}(t, \infty)\right),$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\varphi(aX + bY) &\le \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{X - Y}{2\max\{|a|^{-1}, |b|^{-1}\}} \in \varphi^{-1}(t, \infty)\right) dt \\ &= \mathbb{E}\varphi\left(\frac{X - Y}{2\max\{|a|^{-1}, |b|^{-1}\}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 7.4. *Take $\varphi(x) = \|x\|^p$ for $p < 0$. The above result will yield Theorem 7.4 when the two norms are the same. Let φ and ϕ be two non-negative symmetric unimodal functions. The comparison between $\mathbb{E}\varphi(aX + bY)$ and $\mathbb{E}\phi(X - Y)$ usually involves the comparison of the gauges $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi,t}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\phi,t}$ induced by the symmetric convex sets $\varphi^{-1}(t, \infty)$ and $\phi^{-1}(t, \infty)$, respectively. That is related to the study of the entropy number $N(a, b, \varphi^{-1}(t, \infty), \psi^{-1}(t, \infty))$ defined in Theorem 5.1, which is a function of t rather than a constant. We do not explore this direction in the current paper.*

The following result is complementary to Theorem 7.4 in the sense that we will assume that one of a, b is zero. Then Theorem 3.4 will play the same role as Theorem 5.1 in the proof of Theorem 7.4.

Theorem 7.6. *Let $p > 0$ be a real number. For any i.i.d. random variables X, Y taking values in V, we have*

$$(\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|_2^p)^{1/p} \leq 2^{1+1/p}\|I\| \cdot (\mathbb{E}\|X\|_1^p)^{1/p}. \tag{37}$$

Proof. We can assume that the right hand side of (37) is finite.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|X\|_1^p &= p\int_0^\infty t^{p-1}\mathbb{P}(\|X\|_1 > t)dt \\ &= p\int_0^\infty t^{p-1}\left(1 - \mathbb{P}(\|X\|_1 \leq t)\right)dt.\end{aligned}$$

By the geometric interpretation (34) of $\|I\|$ and Theorem 3.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\|X\|_1 \leq t) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|X\|_2 \leq \|I\|t) \\ &\leq (\mathbb{P}(\|X - Y\|_2 \leq 2\|I\|t))^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|X\|_1^p &\geq p\int_0^\infty t^{p-1}\left(1 - (\mathbb{P}(\|X - Y\|_2 \leq 2\|I\|t))^{1/2}\right)dt \\ &\geq \frac{p}{2}\int_0^\infty t^{p-1}\left(1 - \mathbb{P}(\|X - Y\|_2 \leq 2\|I\|t)\right)dt \\ &= \frac{p}{2}\int_0^\infty t^{p-1}\mathbb{P}(\|X - Y\|_2 > 2\|I\|t)dt \\ &= 2^{-p-1}\|I\|^{-p} \cdot \mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|_2^p.\end{aligned}$$

Then we can get the estimate (37) by taking $1/p$-th root. In the 2nd inequality, we use the simple observation $1 - t \leq 2(1 - \sqrt{t})$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$.

□

7.3 Reverse Hölder-type inequalities

The reverse Hölder inequality asserts the equivalence of higher and lower moments of random variables. More precisely, there exists a constant $C(p, q)$ depending only on $q \geq p$ such that

$$(\mathbb{E}\|X\|^q)^{1/q} \leq C(p, q)(\mathbb{E}\|X\|^p)^{1/p}$$

holds for random variables X in certain normed measurable space. In general such an inequality does not hold. However, reverse Hölder inequalities do hold for a class of random variables, namely those with log-concave distributions. For example, Borell [8] showed the equivalence between the p-th and q-th moments of log-concave random variables for $q \geq p \geq 1$, while Latała [42] demonstrated that the constant $C(p, q)$ can be independent of p. Many results of this type are surveyed in [7].

A finite Borel measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is called log-concave if we have

$$\mu(\lambda A + (1 - \lambda)B) \geq \mu(A)^\lambda \mu(B)^{1-\lambda}$$

for all $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ and all non-empty Borel sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Here $\lambda A + (1 - \lambda)B$ stands for the Minkowski sum $\{\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b : a \in A, b \in B\}$. A random variable is called log-concave if its distribution is log-concave. Log-concave distributions consist of a large class of distributions,

such as Gaussian distribution, exponential distribution, and uniform distribution over any convex set. An important fact implied by Prékopa-Leindler inequality is that the sum and difference of independent log-concave random variables are still log-concave. Therefore it is reasonable to expect reverse Hölder-type inequalities relating $aX + bY$ and $X - Y$ for i.i.d. log-concave random variables.

To prove such reverse Hölder-type inequalities, we need the following result of Guédon [25], which demonstrates the concentration phenomenon of log-concave probability measures.

Lemma 7.5 (Guédon [25]). *Let μ be a log-concave probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a symmetric convex body. For any $t \geq 1$, we have*

$$\mu((tK)^c) \leq (1 - \mu(K))^{\frac{t+1}{2}}. \tag{38}$$

For any $0 < t \leq 1$, we have

$$\mu(tK) \leq -2t \log(1 - \mu(K)). \tag{39}$$

Remark 7.6. *Guédon's result (38) is a generalization of Borell's lemma, which says*

$$\mu((tK)^c) \leq \mu(K) \left(\frac{1 - \mu(K)}{\mu(K)} \right)^{\frac{t+1}{2}}.$$

It is clear that Borell's lemma is non-trivial only when $\mu(K) > 1/2$.

Let $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|_2$ be two equivalent norms on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Theorem 7.7. *Let a, b be real numbers and at lest one of them is non-zero. Let p, q be real numbers such that $q \geq p > 0$ or $-1 < p \leq q < 0$. Then there exists a constant $C(a, b, p, q)$ such that*

$$(\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|_2^q)^{1/q} \leq C(a, b, p, q) \cdot (\mathbb{E}\|aX + bY\|_1^p)^{1/p}$$

holds for all i.i.d. log-concave random variables X, Y taking values in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof. The proof will be separated in two cases: $ab \neq 0$ and $ab = 0$. Firstly we assume that both a and b are non-zero. If $q \geq p > 0$, we assume that $\mathbb{E}\|aX + bY\|_1^p = 1$. For $r_1 \geq 1$, Chebyshev's inequality implies

$$\mathbb{P}(\|aX + bY\|_1 \leq r_1) \geq 1 - r_1^{-p}.$$

By Theorem 5.1, for any $r_2 \geq 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\|X - Y\|_2 \leq r_2) \geq (1 - r_1^{-p}) N^{-1},$$

where

$$N = \frac{1}{2} \left(N(a^{-1} B_1(r_1), B_2(r_2)) + N(b^{-1} B_1(r_1), B_2(r_2)) \right)$$

and we denote by $B_1(r)$, $B_2(r)$ the closed balls centered at the origin of radius r under the gauges $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|_2$, respectively. For any $s \geq 1$, Guédon's lemma (38) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\|X - Y\|_2 > r_2 s) \leq \Delta^{\frac{s+1}{2}}. \tag{40}$$

where $\Delta = 1 - (1 - r_1^{-p})N^{-1}$. Since $q > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|_2^q &= q\int_0^\infty t^{q-1}\mathbb{P}(\|X - Y\|_2 > t)dt \\ &\leq r_2^q + q\int_{r_2}^\infty t^{q-1}\mathbb{P}\left(\|X - Y\|_2 > t\right)dt.\end{aligned}$$

Combine the estimate (40) with $s = tr_2^{-1}$, then elementary calculations will yield

$$\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|_2^q \leq r_2^q\left(1 + \Gamma(q+1)\Delta^{1/2}\left(-\frac{\log\Delta}{2}\right)^{-q}\right).$$

That implies

$$(\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|_2^q)^{1/q} \leq r_2\left(1 + \Gamma(q+1)\Delta^{1/2}\left(-\frac{\log\Delta}{2}\right)^{-q}\right)^{1/q}.$$

It is clear that the quantity on the right hand side of the above inequality is finite. So we finish the proof of the case $q > p > 0$. For the other case $-1 < p \leq q < 0$, we will assume $\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|_2^q = 1$. For any $r_2 \in [0, 1]$, Chebyshev's inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\|X - Y\|_2 < r_2) \leq r_2^{-q}.$$

For $0 \leq s \leq 1$ and $r_1 \geq 0$, by Guédon's lemma (39) and Theorem 5.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\|aX + bY\|_1 < sr_1) &\leq -2s\log\left(1 - \mathbb{P}(\|aX + bY\|_1 < r_1)\right) \\ &\leq -2s\log(1 - r_2^{-q}N),\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where N is the same as before. For $-1 < p < 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|aX + bY\|_1^p &= -p\int_0^\infty t^{-p-1}\mathbb{P}(\|aX + bY\|_1 < t^{-1})dt \\ &\leq r_1^p - p\int_{r_1^{-1}}^\infty t^{-p-1}\mathbb{P}(\|aX + bY\|_1 < t^{-1})dt.\end{aligned}$$

Combine the estimate (41) with $s = (r_1 t)^{-1}$, then we have

$$\mathbb{E}\|aX + bY\|_1^p \leq r_1^p\left(1 + \frac{2p}{1+p}\log(1 - r_2^{-q}N)\right).$$

Taking the $1/p$-th root we have

$$(\mathbb{E}\|aX + bY\|_1^p)^{1/p} \geq r_1\left(1 + \frac{2p}{1+p}\log(1 - r_2^{-q}N)\right)^{1/p}.$$

For the second case, i.e. only one of a, b is non-zero, we can assume that it is equal to 1. Then we can use Theorem 3.4 instead of Theorem 5.1 to proceed the proof in the exactly same way with only few notation changes. So we omit the proof of this case. □

Remark 7.7. *There is no Hölder-type or reverse Hölder-type inequalities of the following form*

$$(\mathbb{E}\|X + Y\|_1^q)^{1/q} \leq c \cdot (\mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|_2^p)^{1/p}.$$

To see this, we can take X, Y to be uniformly distributed on $[n, n+1]$.

7.4 Positive-definite functions

In this section, we consider the estimate of $\mathbb{E}\varphi(aX+bY)$, where φ is a positive-definite function. The study in the following is independent of the small ball inequalities developed in previous sections.

Let G be an abelian group, and $\varphi : G \to \mathbb{C}$ be a Hermitian function, i.e., a function satisfying $\overline{\varphi(x)} = \varphi(-x)$. The function φ is said to be *positive-definite* if, for any $x_1, \cdots, x_n \in G$ and $c_1, \cdots, c_n \in \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \varphi(x_i - x_j) c_i \overline{c_j} \geq 0.$$

Similarly the Hermitian function φ is said to be *negative-definite* if the reversed inequality holds under the condition $\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i = 0$. For example, for $0 < p \leq 2$, the function $e^{-\|x\|^p}$ is positive-definite over the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$.

The famous Bochner's theorem asserts that a continuous positive-definite function φ on a locally compact abelian group G can be uniquely represented as the Fourier transform of a positive finite Radon measure μ on the Pontryagin dual group G^*, i.e.

$$\varphi(x) = \int_{G^*} \xi(x) d\mu(\xi). \tag{42}$$

The counterpart of Bochner's theorem is the Lévy-Khinchin representation formula for a continuous negative-definite function φ on $\mathbb{R}^d$, i.e.

$$\varphi(x) = c + i\langle y_0, x\rangle + q(x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}} \left(1 - e^{-i\langle x,y\rangle} - \frac{i\langle x,y\rangle}{1+\|y\|^2}\right) d\mu(y) \tag{43}$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $q(x)$ is some quadratic form on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and μ is a Lévy measure. The close relations between these two types of functions has been well studied. For example, a function φ is negative-definite if and only if $e^{-t\varphi}$ is positive-definite for all $t > 0$. This observation goes back to Schoenberg. They are also closely related to another important type of functions, the so-called completely monotone functions. We refer to [5, 6] for more details in this direction.

Theorem 7.8. *Let G be a locally compact abelian group and let $\varphi : G \to \mathbb{C}$ be a continuous positive-definite function. For independent random variables X, Y taking values in G and $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have*

$$|\mathbb{E}\varphi(mX+nY)|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\varphi(mX - mX')\mathbb{E}\varphi(nY - nY'),$$

where X', Y' are independent copies of X, Y, respectively.

Proof. Using Bochner's theorem (42), we have

$$|\mathbb{E}\varphi(mX+nY)| = \left|\mathbb{E}\int_{G^*} \xi(mX+nY)d\mu(\xi)\right| = \left|\int_{G^*} \mathbb{E}\xi(mX)\mathbb{E}\xi(nY)d\mu(\xi)\right|$$

The second equation follows from Fubini's theorem and the assumption that X, Y are inde-

pendent. By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left(\int_{G^*} |\mathbb{E}\xi(mX)|^2 d\mu(\xi) \int_{G^*} |\mathbb{E}\xi(nY)|^2 d\mu(\xi)\right)^{1/2} \\
&= \left(\int_{G^*} \mathbb{E}\xi(mX)\overline{\mathbb{E}\xi(mX)} d\mu(\xi) \int_{G^*} \mathbb{E}\xi(nY)\overline{\mathbb{E}\xi(nY)} d\mu(\xi)\right)^{1/2} \\
&= \left(\int_{G^*} \mathbb{E}\xi(mX)\mathbb{E}\overline{\xi(mX)} d\mu(\xi) \int_{G^*} \mathbb{E}\xi(nY)\cdot\mathbb{E}\overline{\xi(nY)} d\mu(\xi)\right)^{1/2} \\
&= \left(\int_{G^*} \mathbb{E}\xi(mX)\mathbb{E}\xi(-mX) d\mu(\xi) \int_{G^*} \mathbb{E}\xi(nY)\mathbb{E}\xi(-nY) d\mu(\xi)\right)^{1/2} \\
&= \left(\int_{G^*} \mathbb{E}\xi(mX)\mathbb{E}\xi(-mX') d\mu(\xi) \int_{G^*} \mathbb{E}\xi(nY)\mathbb{E}\xi(-nY') d\mu(\xi)\right)^{1/2} \\
&= \left(\mathbb{E}\int_{G^*} \xi(mX-mX') d\mu(\xi)\mathbb{E}\int_{G^*} \xi(nY-nY') d\mu(\xi)\right)^{1/2} \\
&= \left(\mathbb{E}\varphi(mX-mX')\mathbb{E}\varphi(nY-nY')\right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We denote by $\overline{\mathbb{E}\xi(mX)}$ the conjugate of $\mathbb{E}\xi(mX)$, and the equation $\overline{\xi(mX)} = \xi(-mX)$ follows from the fact that $\xi \in G^*$. □

Let V be a topological vector space over a field $\mathbb{F}$. Assume that V is locally compact. Then the following result is an consequence of the above theorem.

Corollary 7.8. *Let $\varphi : V \to \mathbb{C}$ be a continuous positive-definite function. For independent random variables X, Y taking values in V and $a, b \in \mathbb{F}$, we have*

$$|\mathbb{E}\varphi(aX+bY)|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\varphi(aX-aX')\mathbb{E}\varphi(bY-bY'),$$

where X', Y' are independent copies of X, Y, respectively.

Corollary 7.9. *Let G be a locally compact abelian group and let $\varphi : G \to \mathbb{C}$ be a continuous positive-definite function. For i.i.d. random variables X, Y taking values in G, we have*

$$|\mathbb{E}\varphi(X+Y)| \leq \mathbb{E}\varphi(X-Y).$$

Remark 7.10. *Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous negative-definite function. For all i.i.d. random variables X, Y taking values in $\mathbb{R}^d$, Lifshits, et al [47] proved that*

$$\mathbb{E}\varphi(X-Y) \leq \mathbb{E}\varphi(X+Y).$$

Their proof relies on the Lévy-Khinchin representation theorem (43) for continuous negative-definite functions. They also show that $\mathbb{E}\varphi(X+Y) - \mathbb{E}\varphi(X-Y)$ is the variance of an integrated centered Gaussian process.

Corollary 7.11. *Let G be a locally compact abelian group and let $\varphi : G \to \mathbb{C}$ be a continuous positive-definite function. For any random variable X taking values in G, we have*

$$|\mathbb{E}\varphi(X)|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\varphi(X-X'),$$

where X' is an independent copy of X.

References

[1] E. Abbe, J. Li, and M. Madiman. Entropies of weighted sums in cyclic groups and an application to polar codes. *Preprint,* `arXiv:1512.00135`, 2015.

[2] N. Alon and R. Yuster. The 123 theorem and its extensions. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 72(2):322–331, 1995.

[3] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco, and D. Pallara. *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.

[4] Paul Bateman and Paul Erdös. Geometrical extrema suggested by a lemma of Besicovitch. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 58:306–314, 1951.

[5] C. Berg. Stieltjes-Pick-Bernstein-Schoenberg and their connection to complete monotonicity. *Positive Definite Functions: From Schoenberg to Space-Time Challenges*, pages 15–45, 2008.

[6] C. Berg, J. P. R. Christensen, and P. Ressel. *Harmonic analysis on semigroups*, volume 100 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984. Theory of positive definite and related functions.

[7] S. Bobkov, M. Fradelizi, J. Li, and M. Madiman. When can one invert Hölder's inequality? (and why one may want to). *Preprint*, 2016.

[8] C. Borell. Convex measures on locally convex spaces. *Ark. Mat.*, 12:239–252, 1974.

[9] A. Buja, B. F. Logan, J. A. Reeds, and L. A. Shepp. Inequalities and positive-definite functions arising from a problem in multidimensional scaling. *Ann. Statist.*, 22(1):406–438, 1994.

[10] Yu. D. Burago and V. A. Zalgaller. *Geometric inequalities*, volume 285 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988. Translated from the Russian by A. B. Sosinskiĭ, Springer Series in Soviet Mathematics.

[11] A. Burchard. A short course on rearrangement inequalities. *Available online at* `http://www.math.utoronto.ca/almut/rearrange.pdf`, June 2009.

[12] A. Burchard and M. Schmuckenschläger. Comparison theorems for exit times. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 11(4):651–692, 2001.

[13] H. Cohn, A. Kumar, S. Miller, D. Radchenko, and M. S. Viazovska. The sphere packing problem in dimension 24. *Preprint,* `arXiv:1603.06518`, 2016.

[14] J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane. *Sphere packings, lattices and groups*, volume 290 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, New York, third edition, 1999. With additional contributions by E. Bannai, R. E. Borcherds, J. Leech, S. P. Norton, A. M. Odlyzko, R. A. Parker, L. Queen and B. B. Venkov.

[15] J.-M. Deshouillers, G. A. Freiman, and A. A. Yudin. On bounds for the concentration function. II. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 14(3):813–820, 2001.

[16] J.-M. Deshouillers and Sutanto. On the rate of decay of the concentration function of the sum of independent random variables. *Ramanujan J.*, 9(1-2):241–250, 2005.

[17] W. Doeblin. Sur les sommes d'un grand nombre des variables alétoires indépendantes. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 63:23–32, 35–64, 1939.

[18] Z. Dong, J. Li, and W. V. Li. A note on distribution-free symmetrization inequalities. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 28(3):958–967, 2015.

[19] Yu. S. Eliseeva, F. Götze, and A. Yu. Zaitsev. Arak inequalities for concentration functions and the Littlewood–Offord problem. *Preprint,* `arXiv:1506.09034`, 2015.

[20] Yu. S. Eliseeva and A. Yu. Zaitsev. Estimates of the concentration functions of weighted sums of independent random variables. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, 57(4):670–678, 2013.

[21] C. G. Esseen. On the Kolmogorov-Rogozin inequality for the concentration function. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete*, 5:210–216, 1966.

[22] C. G. Esseen. On the concentration function of a sum of independent random variables. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete*, 9:290–308, 1968.

[23] O. Friedland and S. Sodin. Bounds on the concentration function in terms of the Diophantine approximation. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 345(9):513–518, 2007.

[24] E. Giné and J. Zinn. Some limit theorems for empirical processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 12(4):929–998, 1984. With discussion.

[25] O. Guédon. Kahane-Khinchine type inequalities for negative exponent. *Mathematika*, 46(1):165–173, 1999.

[26] T. C. Hales. A proof of the Kepler conjecture. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 162(3):1065–1185, 2005.

[27] W. Hengartner and R. Theodorescu. *Concentration functions*. Academic Press [A Subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1973. Probability and Mathematical Statistics, No. 20.

[28] N. C. Jain and M. B. Marcus. Central limit theorems for $C(S)$-valued random variables. *J. Functional Analysis*, 19:216–231, 1975.

[29] M. Kanter. Probability inequalities for convex sets and multidimensional concentration functions. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 6(2):222–236, 1976.

[30] D. Katona and B. S. Stečkin. Combinatorial numbers, geometric constants and probabilistic inequalities. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 251(6):1293–1296, 1980.

[31] G. Katona. Graphs, vectors and inequalities in probability theory. *Mat. Lapok*, 20:123–127, 1969.

[32] G. O. H. Katona. Inequalities for the distribution of the length of a sum of random vectors. *Teor. Verojatnost. i Primenen.*, 22(3):466–481, 1977.

[33] G. O. H. Katona. Continuous versions of some extremal hypergraph problems. In *Combinatorics (Proc. Fifth Hungarian Colloq., Keszthely, 1976), Vol. II*, volume 18 of *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, pages 653–678. North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1978.

[34] G. O. H. Katona. Continuous versions of some extremal hypergraph problems. II. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, 35(1-2):67–77, 1980.

[35] G. O. H. Katona. Sums of vectors and Turán's problem for 3-graphs. *European J. Combin.*, 2(2):145–154, 1981.

[36] G. O. H. Katona. "Best" estimations on the distribution of the length of sums of two random vectors. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 60(3):411–423, 1982.

[37] G. O. H. Katona. Sums of vectors and Turán's graph problem. In *Combinatorial mathematics (Marseille-Luminy, 1981)*, volume 75 of *North-Holland Math. Stud.*, pages 377–382. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1983.

[38] G. O. H. Katona. Probabilistic inequalities from extremal graph results (a survey). In *Random graphs '83 (Poznań, 1983)*, volume 118 of *North-Holland Math. Stud.*, pages 159–170. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985.

[39] B. Kawohl. *Rearrangements and convexity of level sets in PDE*, volume 1150 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.

[40] H. Kesten. A sharper form of the Doeblin-Lévy-Kolmogorov-Rogozin inequality for concentration functions. *Math. Scand.*, 25:133–144, 1969.

[41] A. Kolmogorov. Sur les propriétés des fonctions de concentrations de M. P. Lévy. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré*, 16:27–34, 1958.

[42] R. Latała. On the equivalence between geometric and arithmetic means for log-concave measures. In *Convex geometric analysis (Berkeley, CA, 1996)*, volume 34 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 123–127. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[43] J. Leech. The problem of the thirteen spheres. *Math. Gaz.*, 40:22–23, 1956.

[44] V. I. Levenšteĭn. Boundaries for packings in n-dimensional Euclidean space. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 245(6):1299–1303, 1979.

[45] P. Lévy. *Théorie de l'addition des variables aléatoires*. Paris, 1937.

[46] E. H. Lieb and M. Loss. *Analysis*, volume 14 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2001.

[47] M. Lifshits, R. L. Schilling, and I. Tyurin. A probabilistic inequality related to negative definite functions. *Progress in Probability*, 66(73–80), 2013.

[48] M. Madiman and I. Kontoyiannis. The entropies of the sum and the difference of two IID random variables are not too different. In *Proc. IEEE Intl. Symp. Inform. Theory*, Austin, Texas, June 2010.

[49] M. Madiman and I. Kontoyiannis. Entropy bounds on abelian groups and the Ruzsa divergence. *Preprint,* `arXiv:1508.04089`, 2015.

[50] M. Madiman, J. Melbourne, and P. Xu. Forward and reverse entropy power inequalities in convex geometry. *Preprint,* `arXiv:1604:04225`, 2016.

[51] M. Madiman, J. Melbourne, and P. Xu. Rogozin's convolution inequality for locally compact groups. *Preprint*, 2016.

[52] M. Madiman, L. Wang, and J. O. Woo. Entropy inequalities for sums in prime cyclic groups. *Preprint*, 2016.

[53] J. Marcinkiewicz and A. Zygmund. Quelques inégalités pour les opérations linéaires. *Fund. Math.*, 32:115–121, 1939.

[54] L. Mattner. Strict definiteness of integrals via complete monotonicity of derivatives. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 349(8):3321–3342, 1997.

[55] A. L. Mirošnikov and B. A. Rogozin. Inequalities for concentration functions. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.*, 25(1):178–183, 1980.

[56] O. R. Musin. The problem of the twenty-five spheres. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 58(4(352)):153–154, 2003.

[57] H. H. Nguyen and V. H. Vu. Small ball probability, inverse theorems, and applications. In *Erdös centennial*, volume 25 of *Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud.*, pages 409–463. János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest, 2013.

[58] A. M. Odlyzko and N. J. A. Sloane. New bounds on the number of unit spheres that can touch a unit sphere in n dimensions. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 26(2):210–214, 1979.

[59] D. Pollard. Asymptotics via empirical processes. *Statist. Sci.*, 4(4):341–366, 1989. With comments and a rejoinder by the author.

[60] B. A. Rogozin. On the increase of dispersion of sums of independent random variables. *Teor. Verojatnost. i Primenen*, 6:106–108, 1961.

[61] M. Rudelson and R. Vershynin. The Littlewood-Offord problem and invertibility of random matrices. *Adv. Math.*, 218(2):600–633, 2008.

[62] A. F. Sidorenko. Extremal estimates of probability measures and their combinatorial nature. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 46(3):535–568, 671, 1982.

[63] R. Siegmund-Schultze and H. von Weizsäcker. Level crossing probabilities. I. One-dimensional random walks and symmetrization. *Adv. Math.*, 208(2):672–679, 2007.

[64] M. S. Viazovska. The sphere packing problem in dimension 8. *Preprint,* `arXiv:1603.04246`, 2016.

[65] L. Wang and M. Madiman. Beyond the entropy power inequality, via rearrangements. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 60(9):5116–5137, September 2014.

[66] T. Watanabe. The isoperimetric inequality for isotropic unimodal Lévy processes. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 63(4):487–499, 1983.